

identifier to first and second sequence of data. The Examiner additionally stated that the respective inventions of Groups II and I are related as combination and subcombination. Further, the Examiner stated that the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because parsing of first and second data types does not rely upon pre-defining token identifier to first and second sequence of data.

The examiner finally concludes that these inventions are distinct and states the search required for Group I is not required for Group II.

In view of the Examiner's requirements, Applicant makes the required election.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 23, 2007

By: /H. Dale Langley, Jr./
H. Dale Langley, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,927

The Law Firm of H. Dale Langley, Jr., P.C.
610 West Lynn
Austin, Texas 78703
Telephone: (512) 477-3830
Facsimile: (512) 480-0858
Email: dlangley@iptechlaw.com